

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 LARISA BOWERS,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 THE PROGRESSIVE CORPORATION  
7 AKA PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

8 Defendant

Case No.: 2:23-cv-00694-APG-BNW

**Order Remanding Case for Lack of  
Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

9 I previously ordered defendant The Progressive Corporation to show cause why this case  
10 should not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 5.  
11 Specifically, I directed Progressive to fully identify its citizenship because it had not stated  
12 where it has its principal place of business. *Id.* at 1 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1)). Progressive  
13 did not correct this deficiency in its response to the order to show cause. ECF No. 14. More  
14 importantly, Progressive's response does not change my conclusion that Progressive has not met  
15 its burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy  
16 exceeds \$75,000. *See Roe v. Michelin N. Am., Inc.*, 613 F.3d 1058, 1062 (11th Cir. 2010) (stating  
17 that courts may use their judicial experience and common sense in determining whether the case  
18 stated in a complaint meets federal jurisdictional requirements").

19 I THEREFORE ORDER that this action is remanded to the state court from which it was  
20 removed for all further proceedings. The clerk of the court is instructed to close this case.

21 DATED this 22nd day of May, 2023.



22 ANDREW P. GORDON  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE